

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed December 16, 2004, the period in which to respond has been extended to and including April 16, 2005 by the accompanying petition for a retroactive one-month extension of time.

In the subject Office action, (1) Claims 4 and 6 were objected to as being informal; and (2) Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,735,712 (HAAS et al.).

By the present amendment, applicants have cancelled claim 8 and have amended claims 1-6, 9, 11 and 13, and have presented arguments in support of patentability of the pending amended and original claims. Reconsideration of this application and entry of this amendment are respectfully requested.

The informalities of claims 4 and 6 have been overcome by amendments to those claims.

Turning now to the rejection of the claims based upon prior art, the Examiner asserts that all of the claims are anticipated by HAAS et al. He is incorrect. Amended claim 1 calls for the shielding cage to have a "conductive" interior wall that electrically couples the cover and bottom members together. HAAS et al. does not have (or even suggest) this structure for it uses a plastic (insulative and non-conductive) housing 12 that is inserted into the outer shield 200. The presence of the housing in HAAS et al. prevents the use of a conductive interior wall. Still further, the location of the engagement tab has now been recited in amended claim 1, and it is aligned with the interior wall(s) of the cage so to resist bending of either the cover or bottom member during assembly of the gasket onto the cage. HAAS et al. not only has no interior wall(s) but its gasket engagement tabs 79', 210 are aligned with the center of the receptacles in the housing and not with any conductive interior walls that do not exist in HAAS et al anyway. HAAS et al in no way either anticipates or renders obvious amended claims 1-7 and 9-10. The withdrawal of the rejection of these claims and the allowance thereof are respectfully requested..

As to the rejection of claims 11-13, it is noted as above that HAAS et al. has no conductive inner walls so it cannot possibly anticipate amended claims 11-13. It also does not suggest the contact arms that hold the gasket as being aligned with the inner walls as recited in claim 13. There is no anticipation of these claims by HAAS et al.

A favorable response is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date: 23 March 2005

By: Thomas D. Paulius

Thomas D. Paulius
Registration No. 30,792

MOLEX INCORPORATED
2222 Wellington Court
Lisle, Illinois 60532
(630) 527-4897